



FIFTH COMMITTEE  
41st meeting  
held on  
Tuesday, 2 December 1980  
at 10.30 a.m.  
New York

SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 41st MEETING

Chairman: Mr. BUJ-FLORES (Mexico)

Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Administrative  
and Budgetary Questions: Mr. MSELLE

CONTENTS

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (continued)

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by  
the First Committee in document A/C.1/35/L.7 concerning agenda item 44  
(continued)

---

\*This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the  
signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one month of the date  
of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room A-3550,  
866 United Nations Plaza (Alcoa Building), and incorporated in a copy of the  
record.

*Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate fascicle for  
each Committee.*

**Distr. GENERAL**  
A/C.5/35/SR.41  
8 December 1980

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

/...

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 a.m.

AGENDA ITEM 91: PROGRAMME BUDGET FOR THE BIENNIUM 1980-1981 (continued)

United Nations accommodation at Nairobi (continued) (A/35/7/Add.11; A/C.5/35/35 and Add.1)

1. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation strongly supported the view put forward by the representative of Sweden that financial rule 110.21, dealing with the award of contracts, should be strictly observed. It was gravely concerned both at the Secretariat's reticence about the way in which the Nairobi project had been handled and at the apparent failure to award the contract to the lowest acceptable bidder.
2. The question arose, however, whether the rejection of all bids had served the interests of the Organization. If the Committee agreed that the report of the Executive Director of UNEP (A/C.5/35/35/Add.1) provided valid grounds for a substantial reduction in the original building plans, then it must conclude that the rejection of all bids was justified, whatever the original motive might have been. His delegation agreed with the Advisory Committee that the case has been substantiated, and it therefore supported the Executive Director's proposals. If those proposals were adopted by the Assembly, his delegation trusted that the new contract would be awarded in accordance with financial rule 110.21.
3. Mr. NUTT (Canada) said that the construction project at Nairobi had proceeded in an inappropriate and unacceptable manner. The Secretary-General had informed the General Assembly at the thirty-second session that the construction project represented the minimum facilities that should be built. At the thirty-fourth session the Secretary-General had stated that conference and common service facilities were difficult to expand and that the projected conference requirements of UNEP remained as reported at the thirty-second session. Yet, the Executive Director of UNEP was now recommending, in the interests of economy, that the proposed office space requirements and conference facilities should be reviewed. His delegation was, of course, concerned that any expansion of facilities should conform to real needs. However, given the fact that as recently as the preceding session representatives of the Secretary-General had still insisted that the original plan was fully justified, the new plan would appear either to suggest bad judgement with regard to the original plan or to be a means of circumventing the rule requiring acceptance of the lowest bid. His delegation must insist on strict compliance with the Financial Regulations and Rules and, in that connexion, would like to know why the decision on the bid had been referred to Headquarters and then many weeks later referred back to Nairobi.
4. In view of an annual inflation rate approaching 30 per cent in the construction industry, he wondered whether the Executive Director genuinely believed that the new centre could be constructed for much less than the current lowest bid. He feared that in two years' time the United Nations would end up with substantially smaller facilities at more or less the same price. Had the Executive Director worked with the originally successful bidder on the scaled-down version,

/...

(Mr. Nutt, Canada)

substantially greater savings could have been realized than those now projected and the new facilities could have been completed at a much earlier date. He asked how much additional expenditure would be required for architects' and consultants' fees in connexion with the second round of designs and estimates.

5. The Advisory Committee had concluded - apparently with some difficulty - that the new proposals represented a more accurate assessment of existing and future requirements than the initial proposals. His delegation would therefore support the Advisory Committee's recommendation to approve the scaled-down version. In that regard, a tender must be accepted as soon as possible in order to minimize costs.

6. He was heartened by the steps taken by the Kenyan Government to resolve certain difficulties which could affect the implementation of the construction project, such as the question of title to the land on which the new buildings would be constructed, satellite communications facilities and the construction of a better access road to central Nairobi. Any amplification or clarification on those points from the Executive Director would also be appreciated.

7. Mr. SCHLINGEMANN (Netherlands) observed that the three lowest bidders in the original tendering process had bid amounts far below the original appropriation for the construction project and even lower than the estimated cost of the revised project. It seemed therefore that, if the Committee approved the new project proposals, the United Nations would end up with less space and the construction work would be completed at a later stage and at a higher cost. According to the documentation submitted, a major part of the savings would result from a reduction in the conference facilities to be constructed. The proposed reduction was based on the assumption that the Governing Council of UNEP might decide to hold its meetings biennially and that the Commission on Human Settlements would continue to meet away from Nairobi. It was, however, doubtful whether the UNEP Governing Council would ever decide to have biennial meetings and many members of the Commission on Human Settlements had expressed a preference for meeting in Nairobi, starting in 1982.

8. The Committee had been informed that the special arrangements between UNEP and the Kenyatta Conference Centre would be terminated as soon as the construction of the new United Nations facilities was completed. He asked whether that implied that the cost of meetings at that Centre would be greater and, if so, whether the increased cost had been taken into account in analysing the costs and benefits of scaling down the proposed facilities.

9. As the decision to revise the design of the project appeared to have been influenced by political factors, it made good sense that there was close co-operation between the Executive Director of UNEP and the Secretary-General. His delegation would welcome information on the way they intended to proceed should similar political complications arise with respect to the new tendering process. He noted that the Advisory Committee had referred in its report to the proposal to *reduce the area for information services*. Since the Executive Director of UNEP had indicated in his report that no change in the space requirements

/...

(Mr. Schlingemann, Netherlands)

of the Centre for Human Settlements was envisaged, he presumed that the proposed reduction represented reduced requirements of UNEP for information activities.

10. Mr. GODFREY (New Zealand) said that the statement made by the representative of Kenya at the preceding meeting had helped the Committee to see the matter in perspective. His delegation very much regretted the situation which had arisen; if the normal procedures had been followed, construction would have started several months earlier in accordance with the plans approved by the General Assembly at the thirty-fourth session. That moment had, however, passed and the Committee now had before it an alternative, more modest proposal. The central issue was to determine actual requirements for accommodation at Nairobi. At the preceding session, the Fifth Committee had accepted the Secretary-General's recommendation that the original plans should be expanded. His delegation was fearful that, if the scaled-down plan proposed at the current session was adopted, the General Assembly would before long be faced with an expensive proposal to restore the original scheme or something very near to it.

11. With regard to the comparative costing of the various proposals, he recalled that the General Assembly had at its thirty-fourth session discussed the matter of rising costs of the construction project at Headquarters in New York. It had been that discussion which had led to the adoption of resolution 34/288. While costs were certainly rising, a substantial factor had been delays in signing the contract for the work, and experience showed that such delays resulted in cost escalation far in excess of the level of inflation. The Fifth Committee should give careful consideration to the possibility of reverting to the original scheme and his delegation therefore looked forward to the submission of the Kenyan proposal to that end.

12. Mr. HAMZAH (Syrian Arab Republic) said that his delegation had supported General Assembly resolution 32/208, concerning the establishment of a permanent headquarters for UNEP at Nairobi, and resolution 32/162, which provided that the United Nations Centre for Human Settlements would be located in Nairobi. Those decisions reflected the desire of Member States that United Nations units and bodies should not be situated at Headquarters alone and that the Organization should pursue a policy of decentralization. Although preparatory work on the project authorized by resolution 34/233 had already begun, the UNEP Committee on Contracts had recommended that, in the interests of economy, the office space and conference facilities requirements should be reviewed and all the bids already received should be rejected. His delegation commended the prudent financial management of the Executive Director of UNEP in approving those recommendations and his strict compliance with the directives of the General Assembly as laid down in the relevant resolutions, including resolution 34/228. Financial rule 110.21 clearly authorized the rejection of all bids when it was in the interests of the Organization. A further consideration was the decision by UNHCR and the World Bank that they no longer required office space in the new complex. Such considerations had led the Executive Director to submit his revised proposals, which were clearly based on a more accurate assessment of existing and future requirements than the Secretary-General's original proposals. The Advisory Committee, which was solely concerned with the interests of the Organization, had endorsed those proposals, and his delegation supported their adoption and implementation.

/...

13. Mr. KUYAMA (Japan) said that his delegation had difficulty in reconciling the revised proposals of the Executive Director concerning conference facilities with the earlier recommendations of the Secretary-General in 1977 and 1979. The Secretary-General's proposal to expand the conference facilities at Nairobi had enjoyed the support of the majority of members primarily because they had felt his proposal to be reasonable in the light of requirements and to be justified on the grounds of long-range economies. Nothing had changed with regard to requirements for conference facilities. In the short term, some saving might be effected by adopting the Executive Director's proposals, but it was highly probable that a request for additional conference facilities would be made at a later stage at tremendous additional cost. There was no guarantee, moreover, that the Kenyatta Conference Centre would be available for United Nations meetings after 1982. His delegation was therefore, reluctant to support the Advisory Committee's recommendation as far as conference facilities were concerned.

14. Mr. HAGARA (Uganda) expressed appreciation to the Secretary-General and the Executive Director of UNEP for their efforts to ensure the most economical utilization of United Nations resources in accordance with General Assembly resolution 34/228. His delegation attached great importance to the construction of a United Nations headquarters facility at Nairobi, the first ever in a developing country. It would not accept that the facility should be of an inferior nature to headquarters facilities elsewhere. In view of the decision by the World Bank and the UNHCR to maintain their offices in the city centre of Nairobi, it seemed prudent to go along with the Executive Director's recommendation, endorsed by the Advisory Committee, to reduce the office space to be constructed. With regard to catering facilities, the library and other common services, his delegation supported the conclusions of the Executive Director, as endorsed by the Advisory Committee, with the proviso that the new round of tendering should be on a broad and international basis and that construction should commence as soon as possible.

15. Mr. LÖSCHNER (Federal Republic of Germany) said that his delegation had supported the construction project in its original form in 1977. Since that time the Government of Kenya had shown itself to be most co-operative, and his delegation was particularly grateful for the Kenyan Government's willingness to allow the UNEP Governing Council to hold its meetings at the Kenyatta Conference Centre. The revised proposals of the Executive Director would result in a more economical project, reducing the area to be constructed by some 25 per cent and the total cost by 15 per cent. Given the changed world economic situation and the increased economic difficulties experienced by developed and developing countries alike, his delegation could not but sympathize with the budget-conscious approach taken by the Executive Director, and it therefore supported his proposals, as recommended by the Advisory Committee.

16. Mr. BROCHARD (France) said that the history of the construction project at Nairobi was somewhat unusual. The preceding year, the Secretariat had submitted a proposal to expand the construction project at Nairobi and had requested a sizable appropriation for that purpose. It had been argued that the expansion was necessary to ensure the smooth functioning of the various United Nations units located at Nairobi. His delegation had accepted the explanations put forward by

/...

(Mr. Brochard, France)

the Secretariat at that time and had supported the appropriation requested. At the current session the Committee had before it a revised, scaled-down proposal with the explanation that the reductions should be made in the interests of economy; such a concern for economy on the part of the Secretariat came as quite a surprise to his delegation. While the revised proposals might give rise to some doubts, his delegation had confidence in the Executive Director of UNEP and would therefore go along with his proposals.

17. Mr. GARRIDO (Philippines) asked whether any plans had been made to provide for the future requirements of UNHCR, what the contingency costs included in table 9 of the Executive Director's report covered, and whether there were any plans to rent office space in the new facility as a means of defraying the cost of operating the buildings and earning income.

18. Mr. WILLIAMS (Panama) asked what the cost of the Executive Director's proposals would be per square metre and by what percentage the cost of the project was expected to increase if the proposals were adopted. Referring to the site development plan provided in document A/C.5/35/35/Add.1, he suggested that there might be a need to relocate the delegates' car park.

19. Mr. HILLEL (Israel) said that, since the adoption of General Assembly resolution 34/228, no significant progress had been made in the construction work at Nairobi. His delegation regretted the delay in construction, which had been caused by the Secretariat's attitude to the established rules and procedures, and it trusted that the unjustified and questionable measures taken by the Secretariat would not be repeated in future and that the construction would proceed in an orderly fashion.

20. Mrs. DORSETT (Trinidad and Tobago) expressed her delegation's surprise and discomfiture at the sudden abandonment of plans so recently approved on by the General Assembly. She failed to appreciate the significance of the circumstances that had prompted the Executive Director to revise those plans, particularly as the Advisory Committee, while recommending the approval of the Executive Director's new proposals, seemed to show no great enthusiasm for them.

21. Specific details of the new plans worried her. For example, paragraph 36 of the Executive Director's report (A/C.5/35/35/Add.1) referred, in subparagraph (a), to "covered open meetings" and, in subparagraph (d), to "complete site utilization". She would be glad to receive explanations of both those terms. A substantial cut in restaurant facilities had been proposed, apparently without considering whether staff members' current luncheon habits were a reliable basis on which to forecast demand. The revised plans allowed for expansion at a future date - for example, by adding mezzanine floors to the library as mentioned in paragraph 32 of the Executive Director's report. It seemed to her, however, that deferring the construction of facilities that the Organization would later need, and thereby allowing inflation to push up costs, was not the best way of utilizing resources. Consideration should be given to constructing the additional facilities immediately and renting them out until the United Nations needed them. The Fifth Committee must take a long-term view of the matter.

/...

22. Mr. GEBRU (Ethiopia) said that, although the Executive Director's proposals appeared cost-effective in the short term, their longer-term implications did not appear to have been taken into consideration; construction of the relatively large conference facilities approved by the General Assembly at its thirty-fourth session would help to reduce the Organization's costs in the future. His delegation nevertheless endorsed the revised proposals now before the Committee.

23. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation was willing to rely on the judgement of the Secretariat, even though it favoured the 1977 and 1979 projects.

24. Mr. TOLBA (Executive Director, United Nations Environment Programme) assured members that he had at no time departed from the requirements of financial rule 110.21, had no intention of doing so, and failed to understand the references to "political factors" made by some delegations in that connexion. His only concern, and the exclusive concern of the UNEP Committee on Contracts, had been to achieve economies for the Organization. He rejected any suggestion that he had been responsible for initiating the process; in accordance with established financial procedure, the Executive Director was permitted to act only on the recommendations of the Committee on Contracts.

25. The expected conference servicing requirements of UNEP had given rise to his proposal for the construction of one conference room seating 200 people (A/C.5/35/35/Add.1, para. 27). Additional space had been provided for in 1979 in order to meet the anticipated requirements of UNCHS. The United Nations would continue to hold very large gatherings at the Kenyatta Conference Centre, the Kenyan Government having generously agreed that the Centre could continue to be used on the few days in any one year when it was necessary to hold a meeting for more than 200 participants. It was calculated that the cost of holding the meetings of the Governing Council of UNEP alone in the facilities originally proposed would be many times greater than the commercial rental of the Kenyatta Conference Centre for that purpose.

26. The reasons why a decision on the award of the contract had been referred from Nairobi to Headquarters and back were described in paragraph 5 of his report. The United Nations Legal Counsel had finally determined that responsibility for awarding the contract lay with the Executive Director. The lowest of the bids he had rejected had been for 162 million Kenyan shillings, and he had been advised by the quantity surveyor that the adjusted cost for October 1980 would have been 179 million Kenyan shillings before allowing for professional fees. The estimated cost of the revised construction, as detailed in table 8 of his report, amounted to about 183 million Kenyan shillings including professional fees. It was therefore clear that the revised proposal would produce real savings. The additional consultants' fees entailed by the new proposal would add up to a total of between 7 and 8 million Kenyan shillings or about \$US 1 million, but a part of that cost could be offset by the fees that would be saved through cancelling work on the remaining parts of the old design.

27. He expected to be able to sign both the United Nations title to the land and the supplementary agreement with the Kenyan Government upon his return to Nairobi

/...

(Mr. Tolba, UNEP)

later in the week. He had been informed that, owing to the delay in implementing the project, there would now be no point in establishing the link with the SYMPHONIE satellite that had originally been planned. As for communications with downtown Nairobi, it was his understanding that the current Kenyan budget contained a proposal for an improved access road to the site.

28. The conference and other requirements of the United Nations and UNHCS were already allowed for under the revised project. The reference to "complete site utilization" that had confused the representative of Trinidad and Tobago meant that tremendous areas of extra space had been left on the site so as to permit any future expansion required by the General Assembly to be accomplished without difficulty. Construction costs per square metre had originally been estimated at about \$US 4,000: they were now estimated at about \$US 5,000. The cost figures before the Fifth Committee already allowed for future inflation. The proposed library facilities would be quite adequate to meet expanding demand over the coming five or six years; subsequently, as paragraph 32 of his report indicated, it would be easy to add extra floors as and when required. The reduction in restaurant capacity had been proposed because, if the revised proposals were accepted, any meetings involving more than 200 people would have to be held at the Kenyatta Conference Centre.

29. His aim in submitting the revised proposals was simply to draw attention to one possible way of making economies, and he would welcome whatever guidance the Committee saw fit to give.

Administrative and financial implications of the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/35/L.7 concerning agenda item 44 (continued)  
(A/35/7/Add.14; A/C.5/35/78)

30. Mr. BEGIN (Director, Budget Division) announced that the administrative and financial implications of the amendment proposed at the 40th meeting by the representative of Pakistan to the Advisory Committee's recommendation (A/35/7/Add.14, para. 14) would be \$56,600 for one P-5 post and \$17,300 for one General Service post under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981. In addition, an amount of \$15,100 for the P-5 and \$4,200 for the General Service post would be required for staff assessment under section 31, to be offset by the same amount under income section 1.

31. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana) noted that the extra temporary assistance posts had been requested in connexion with the preparation of background documentation. He wondered what the nature of that documentation was, in particular whether it would be any different from the studies and other background material on disarmament already prepared for the tenth special session of the General Assembly.

32. Mr. CULLEN (Argentina) explained that, although his delegation was always very conscious of the Advisory Committee's concern to keep costs down as much as possible, it had a particular interest in questions of disarmament; indeed, it had been among the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.7. It could support the Pakistan amendment, which represented a compromise between the requests of the Secretary-General and the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

/...



33. Mr. AGBEBI (Nigeria) expressed the hope that the Committee would bear in mind the need not only for economy but also for efficiency and effectiveness. While it was important to ensure in all cases that the Secretary-General was not given more staff than he required to do an effective job, by the same token he should not be denied adequate staff, which could prove to be false economy. It was true, as stated in paragraph 14 of the Advisory Committee's report (A/35/7/Add.14), that the work would be co-ordinated by the Committee and Conference Services Section of the Centre for Disarmament, but it had to be recognized that the planning of the special session would involve more than co-ordination of conference services. The substantive preparations that would be required, including the drafting of background papers, went beyond the normal duties of the existing staff. The Secretary-General had undoubtedly been guided by the experience of the tenth special session in making his request. If it was not possible to grant him everything that he had requested, he should at least be given enough staff to ensure effective preparation for the special session. His delegation would therefore support the Pakistan amendment.

34. Mr. KRYEZIU (Yugoslavia) said that his delegation fully supported the Pakistan amendment to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, and hoped that the Fifth Committee would adopt it as it stood.

35. Mr. NICULESCU (Romania) said that, as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution, his delegation wished to stress the importance it attached to proper preparation of the special session. With that in mind, it could support the amendment proposed by Pakistan to the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

36. Mr. BOUZARBIA (Algeria) said that, on the basis of the clarifications provided by the representative of the Secretary-General, his delegation favoured the amendment proposed by the Pakistan delegation. Normally, he would follow the recommendations of the Advisory Committee but, in the particular case at issue, it seemed that the extra costs were fully justified by the amount of work required for the proper preparation of the special session.

37. Mr. PALAMARCHUK (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) said that his delegation had already explained in detail in the First Committee its position on the substance of the draft resolution. With respect to the administrative and financial implications, it was his delegation's view that the Advisory Committee had adopted a careful and exhaustive approach in studying the question and, on the basis of the additional information obtained from the Secretariat, had reached the conclusion that the requests made by the Secretary-General were not fully warranted. His delegation was in full agreement with the sound conclusions of the Advisory Committee, which it found to be reasonable and proper, and would therefore vote in favour of them.

38. Mr. PAL (India) stated that, by and large, his delegation abided by the excellent recommendations of the Advisory Committee, however, it had been convinced by the arguments put forward by the representatives of Pakistan and Nigeria. The Advisory Committee's recommendation might not provide the necessary resources to the Secretary-General for the satisfactory execution of his mandate under the draft resolution. His delegation was therefore prepared to go along with the Pakistan amendment.

39. Mr. LAHLOU (Morocco) said that his delegation too had decided to support the Pakistan amendment. He regretted that it was unable to support the Advisory Committee's recommendation because it wished to ensure that the Centre for Disarmament was given the necessary means for the efficient preparation of the special session. There were political elements involved which would seem to override considerations of economy.

40. Mr. EL-SAFY (Egypt) said that his delegation had studied the question very carefully in the light of the additional information that had been provided and, although it customarily supported the recommendations of the Advisory Committee, it believed that the amendment introduced by the Pakistan delegation represented a reasonable compromise, which it could support.

41. Mr. OKEYO (Kenya) said that his delegation regretted that it could not support the Advisory Committee's recommendation. The arguments put forward by the delegations of Pakistan and Nigeria had convinced his delegation that the adoption of the Pakistan amendment would be in the interests of the Centre for Disarmament and of Member States.

42. Mr. MARTENSON (Assistant Secretary-General for Disarmament), replying to the question raised by the representative of Ghana, referred the Committee to his statement at the previous meeting with respect to the heavy workload and small staff of the Centre. He explained that extra temporary assistance had been requested in connexion with the preparation of the special session. At the time of the preparatory work for the tenth special session, the Centre had been requested to prepare 12 in-depth studies as background papers in various fields. It was in the light of that experience that the two temporary posts were being requested in connexion with preparations for a second special session devoted to disarmament. He reminded the Committee that for the tenth special session three P-5 temporary posts had been approved, and there was every indication that the task in respect of the forthcoming special session would be even more onerous.

43. The CHAIRMAN announced that a recorded vote had been requested on the recommendation of the Advisory Committee, as amended by the representative of Pakistan. He suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that, should it adopt the draft resolution submitted by the First Committee in document A/C.1/35/L.7 concerning agenda item 44, an additional appropriation of \$139,000 would be required under section 2B of the programme budget for the biennium 1980-1981, plus an amount of \$34,000 under section 31, to be offset by an equivalent amount under income section 1.

44. Mr. ZINIEL (Ghana), speaking in explanation of vote before the vote, said that, as one of the sponsors of the draft resolution in document A/C.1/35/L.7, his delegation attached a good deal of importance to disarmament questions. Given that background papers had already been prepared at the time of the tenth special session, his delegation had originally been of the view that the Secretariat already had sufficient documentation and that the arguments in the Advisory Committee's report were both logical and convincing. However, it would vote in favour of the recommendation as amended by the delegation of Pakistan because it had been convinced by the legitimate concerns expressed.

/...

45. Mr. FRASER (United Kingdom) said that his delegation could not vote in favour of the two additional posts proposed by the Pakistan delegation. It was deeply concerned that the Fifth Committee should seek to overturn the expert recommendations of the Advisory Committee on the subject, and appealed to all Member States, in their own best interests, to support the Advisory Committee's recommendation.

46. A recorded vote was taken on the recommendation contained in paragraphs 14 and 15 of the report of the Advisory Committee (A/35/7/Add.14), as amended by the representative of Pakistan.

In favour: Algeria, Argentina, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Barbados, Benin, Brazil, Burma, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chile, China, Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Finland, Gabon, Ghana, Greece, Guyana, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Morocco, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Romania, Rwanda, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Cameroon, Upper Volta, Venezuela, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against: Afghanistan, Australia, Belgium, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, German Democratic Republic, Germany, Federal Republic of, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Japan, Mongolia, Netherlands, New Zealand, Poland, Portugal, Singapore, Spain, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Abstaining: Ivory Coast, Malaysia, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago.

47. The recommendation, as amended, was adopted by 73 votes to 24, with 4 abstentions.

48. The CHAIRMAN suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that conference servicing costs not exceeding \$1,192,000 would be considered in the context of the consolidated statement of conference servicing costs to be submitted later in the session. Referring to paragraph 12 of the Advisory Committee's report, as orally amended by the Chairman of the Advisory Committee at the 40th meeting, he further suggested that the Fifth Committee should inform the General Assembly that summary record coverage, as requested in operative paragraph 4 of the draft resolution, would require approval by the General Assembly of an explicit exception to resolution 35/10 B. If he heard no objection, he would take it that the Committee wished to make those recommendations.

49. It was so decided.

The meeting rose at 1.15 p.m.